

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

KIMBERLY SWEENEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

HORIZON SPECIALTY HOSPITAL,

Defendant.

Case No.2:15-cv-00053-GMN-PAL

REPORT OF FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff Kimberly Sweeney's failure to file an amended complaint. This matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and LR IB 1-4.

Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. On February 3, 2015, the court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis, and screened Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). *See* Order (Dkt. #3). The court found the complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted and permitted Plaintiff to file an amended complaint on or before March 2, 2015. Plaintiff was warned that if she failed to file an amended complaint, this case could be dismissed. Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or requested an extension of time to do so.

Accordingly,

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that the Clerk of Court be directed to close this case.

Dated this 11th day of March, 2015.

  
PEGGY A. LEEN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**NOTICE**

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court. Pursuant to Local Rule of Practice (LR) IB 3-2(a), any party wishing to object to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge shall file and serve *specific written objections* together with points and authorities in support of those objections, within fourteen days of the date of service of the findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the district court’s order. *See Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). The points and authorities filed in support of the specific written objections are subject to the page limitations found in LR 7-4.